

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached drawing sheet includes additional Fig. 4 which illustrates an illumination module including the LED sheet, as described on page 13, lines 29-34 of the specification. As the LED sheet was described in the original description as filed, no new matter is being added.

Attachment: New Sheet containing Fig. 4

REMARKS

Claims 2-9, 12-14, 16, 17 and 19-36 are currently pending, wherein claims 11, 15, and 18 have been canceled, claims 2, 5-9, 12-14, and 17 have been amended, and new claims 19-36 have been added. Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration in view of the remarks presented herein below.

At the outset, Applicant notes with appreciation the indication that claims 9 and 13 contain allowable subject matter and would be allowed if rewritten in independent form, and that claim 16 is allowed. Applicant hereby amends claims 9 and 13 to be in independent form. Therefore, claims 9 and 13 are patentable over the cited art.

In paragraph 2 of the Action, the Examiner objects to the drawings because the LED sheet recited in claim 18 is not shown. Claim 18 has been canceled, rendering this objection moot. However, new claims 22 and 31 recite an LED sheet. Accordingly, Applicant hereby amends the drawings to include the claimed LED sheet as described on page 5 line 17-24 and page 13, lines 29-34 of the specification. (See new Fig. 4.)

In paragraph 3 of the Action, the Examiner objects to the specification because the following reference characters are allegedly not mentioned in the description: 22, 24, 25, and 26 (Fig. 3). Applicant points the Examiner to page 10, lines 6-30 wherein the description of Fig. 3 includes a description of reference characters 22, 24, 25, and 26. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection.

In paragraph 4 of the Action, the Examiner objects to the specification because the title is allegedly not descriptive. Applicant hereby amends the title to be even more descriptive, thereby addressing the Examiner's concerns.

In paragraph 5 of the Action, the Examiner objects to the specification for allegedly failing to provide proper antecedent bases for the LED sheet. Applicant respectfully points to the Examiner's attention to page 5, lines 17-24 and/or page 13, lines 29-34 of the specification wherein the LED sheet is clearly described.

In paragraph 7 of the Action, the Examiner rejects claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Applicant hereby amends claim 14 to even more clearly define the presented invention, thereby addressing the Examiner's concerns. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

In paragraph 10 of the Action, the Examiner rejects claims 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 11, 12, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by International Patent Publication No. WO 01/18776 to Georges et al. ("Georges"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, and 12, as amended, variously depend from independent claim 9. Therefore, claims 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, and 12 are patentable over Georges because they depend from allowable claim 9. In addition, claims 11 and 15 have been canceled, rendering this rejection moot with regard thereto. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 11, 12, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

In paragraphs 12 of the Action, the Examiner rejects claims 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,031,468 to Tsao et al. ("Tsao"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 17, as amended, variously depends from independent claim 9. Therefore, claim 17 is patentable over Tsao because it depends from allowable claim 9. In addition, claim 18 has

been canceled, rendering this rejection moot with regard thereto. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

In paragraphs 14-18 of the Action, the Examiner rejects claims 4 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Georges in view of either U.S. Patent No. 6,107,941 to Jones ("Jones") or U.S. Patent No. 3,786,245 to Cincotta et al. ("Cincotta"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 4 and 6 now variously depend from independent claim 9. Therefore claims 4 and 6 are patentable over the combination of Georges and Jones, or Georges and Cincotta because they depend from allowable claim 9. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 4 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).


New claims 19-36 variously depend from independent claims 9, 13, or 16. Therefore, new claims 19-36 are patentable over the cited prior art for at least the reason that they dependent from an allowable or allowed claim.

The application is in condition for allowance. Notice of same is earnestly solicited. Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Penny Caudle (Reg. No. 46,607) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: July 20, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Charles Gorenstein
Registration No.: 29,271
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant